

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Demonstration Site: San Francisco <hr/> County Contact: Name: <u>Liz Crudo</u> Phone: <u>415-557-6502</u> Email: <u>liz.crudo@sfgov.org</u>	Reporting Period: 1/1/12-12/31/12 Calendar Year <u>2012</u>
--	--

Instructions: Pursuant to the legislative requirements for implementing RBS, each county participating in the RBS Demonstration Project shall prepare and submit an annual report. The report is to be developed in collaboration with the private nonprofit agency(ies) participating in the demonstration project. This County Annual Report (CAR) is to be prepared by the county as a single, comprehensive report for the reporting period. The report is prepared for each calendar year in which the RBS Reform Project is in operation and submitted by March 1 of the following year to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) at RBSreform@dss.ca.gov.

Section A - Client Outcomes:

1. **Complete the table below on the characteristics of the target population served in this reporting period.**

Total Number Of Youth:	Average Age Of Youth:	Number Of Youth Who Are:	Number Of Youth Who Are:	Number Of Youth Placed By:
39	14.7 years	Male: 23 Female: 16	African-American: 29 Caucasian: 1 Hispanic: 9	Probation: 0 Child Welfare: 39 Mental Health: 0 Other: 0

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- 2. Complete and attach one excel document titled, “RBS Days of Care Schedule” for each RBS provider listing information for each youth enrolled in RBS since implementation of the project. This document captures information on the total days in care in residential, community-based bridge care, after-care and crisis stabilization, beginning with the youth’s initial enrollment in RBS.**
- a. For those youth who were both active in RBS during the reporting period and enrolled in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement, what percent exceeded the site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement and by an average of how many days?**

About 51% (20 clients out of 39 total) of the active cases in 2012 remained in the residential component for more than 5 months since enrolling in RBS.

The average number of days for this group was 307.75 days.

- b. For those youth who exited (for any reason) from the RBS program during the reporting period, what percent exceeded the approved site target for average length of stay in the full RBS program (residential plus community) and by an average of how many days?**

About 50% of the clients who disenrolled from RBS in 2012 (6 out of 12) had remained in the residential component for more than 5 months.

The average number of days for that group was 293.5 days.

- c. What number and percent of youth stepped down from group home residential placement to a lower level of care during the reporting period? Of those youth who stepped down, what number and percent returned to group home residential care? For any youth who stepped down to a lower level of care and returned to group home residential care multiple times, describe the number of youth and the reasons for each movement up and down in level of care.**

- 13 out of the 39 active clients in 2012 stepped down from residential to family settings during 2012.
- Of the 13 who stepped down in 2012, 2 (or 15%) stepped back up to the residential component of RBS.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

The reasons why 2 youth stepped back up to the residential component were:

- 1) In the first case an attempt was made to step down this youth to live with a relative out of state. This involved significant RBS support. This placement was not sustainable and the RBS provider needed to return him to their RBS residential component.
- 2) An adoptive home was found for the second youth. The RBS team made every effort to support this placement, but the family did not feel that they could handle this youth, so he returned to the RBS residential component.

There were 2 other youth who had stepped down in 2011 to ITFC homes, but returned to the residential component in 2012 after their foster placements disrupted. The RBS provider has been working to find an alternate family placement for these 2 boys.

- d. Of those youth active in RBS during the reporting period, what number and percent exited from RBS due to graduation, emancipation, voluntary closure, and other (as defined by “Current Status Code” in the RBS Days of Care Schedule)? Of those exiting as “other”, describe the reasons for disenrollment.**

Of the 39 active cases in 2012, there were a total of 12 disenrollments. Of these 12 disenrollments, 3 were due to graduations (code #4), 1 was due to voluntary closure (code #7), and 8 were closed for reasons other than graduation or emancipation (code #6).

For those 8 that disenrolled for other reasons: 2 awoled, 2 hospitalized, and 4 were agency decisions to disenroll.

Of the 4, it was an agency decision to disenroll; the primary reasons included a need for a higher level of care to address severe mental health issues. In addition, for 3 of these 4 youth, there had been attempts to place with family in the community, but these placements failed due to the youth’s mental health challenges and safety concerns.

- e. Of those youth who exited from RBS since implementation of the RBS program, what number and percent re-enrolled in RBS during this reporting period?**

There was one youth (2%) who represents a re-enrollment (counted twice) out of the total of 42 youth enrolled since the pilot started.

- f. What percent of youth utilized crisis stabilization services during the reporting period? Of those youth, what was the average number of**

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

episodes of crisis stabilization per youth? List the reasons why the crisis stabilization episode occurred:

About five youths out of 39 active cases in 2012 utilized crisis stabilization (13%)

The average number of episodes for these five youths was 1.6.

These episodes occurred when an escalation in the community was not manageable without a brief return for crisis stabilization. The behaviors that led to crisis stabilization included being either a danger to themselves or others.

Section B - Client Involvement:

1. **Using the Child and Adolescence Needs and Strengths (CANS) data provided by Walter R. McDonald and Associates, Inc. (WRMA), address the following:**

- a. **Describe any trends indicated by the CANS data.**

Of the 39 active cases, there was CANS data for 34 youths (87%). The reasons for less than 100% participation include: some youth awoled from program prior to an assessment being completed, and for a couple others they left the program prior to completion of the assents and consents.

Among those youth who had CANS data completed, there was significant and increasing attrition in completion of each subsequent follow up CANS. Some of the attrition is due to early disenrollments from the RBS program for a number of youth.

- b. **Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?**

[] Yes [X] No Explain:

For a number of reasons, we cannot observe trends in the data to date. First, the sample is very small, particularly after the baseline (n=34). Follow-up 1 included 24 youths, follow-up 2 included 14 youths, and follow-up 3 included only 3 youths. One reason for the attrition, as described above, is that some youth disenrolled early. These youth were among the hardest to serve, and their elimination biases the sample. The

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

impact of the bias increases at subsequent follow-ups, where very few youth remained in the sample.

Second, because the data do not indicate which youth stepped down, it is not possible to conclude whether there is an association between longer program participation and an *increase* in need or a *decrease* in need. Aside from the early disenrollments, one might expect that those who remain in RBS longer are more difficult cases, and we would expect higher needs scores for such youth. Relatedly, the data are reported for active cases in the year which mixes the in-care and admission groups. The result is that we do not know the length of time each child has been in RBS; i.e., some had not been in the program long enough to be eligible for follow up assessments.

Third, without knowing how much individual scores varied within each time period, we could not conclude that observed changes in scores over time are true trends. For example, the average baseline score for the Risk Behaviors domain was 5.8. At follow-up 1, it was 5.6 and at follow-up 2, it was 4.6. If the individual scores that made up these averages varied widely, say between 6.0 and 1.0, then the observed changes were small (not a trend). On the other hand, if the individual scores varied narrowly, say between 6.0 and 4.5, then the observed changes would be relatively larger (perhaps a trend).

Fourth, several youth did not complete the CANS, either because they did not consent or because they AWOLed prior to receiving it, making the remaining children in the sample very different from the full set of children who received RBS. Even if the scores showed a trend over time we could not conclude that they were attributable to RBS services.

After one more year of observation, it is hoped that the sample sizes at the follow up periods will be large enough to observe trends. However, the second and third issues will remain a problem and will diminish the ability to connect the CANS scores to RBS program participation.

2. a. Complete the table below on family and youth participation in child/family team meetings during the reporting period.

Total Number Of Youth:	Total Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult During Any Part Of The Reporting Period:	Number Of Youth Participating In At Least 90% Of Their Child/Family Team Meetings:	Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult Participating In At Least 90% Of That Youth's Child/Family Team Meetings:
39	39	31	36

b. If youth did not participate, explain why not.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

The reasons for not participating included: youth's refusal, family's insistence that youth not be present for certain meetings where the subject matter was sensitive and would be disturbing to the youth, and the youth's inability to handle sitting through an entire meeting due to their mental health issues. All three RBS providers made efforts to include youth in some portion, if not all, of their family team meetings.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

Section C - Client Satisfaction:

1. **Using the Youth Services Survey for Youth (YSS) and Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F) data provided by WRMA, specifically satisfaction measured in Items 1-15 of the YSS and YSS-F and outcomes measured in Items 16-22 of the YSS and YSS-F, address the following:**

- a. **Describe any trends in the data.**

Of the 39 active cases, 22 youths participated in the survey (56%). Figures were lower for the YSS-F – 19 families at 49%. Among those, there was significant and increasing attrition in completion of each subsequent follow up. Although the number of youth and families who agreed to participate in the evaluation was much higher, some families and youth did not follow through on completion of these satisfaction surveys.

- b. **Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?**

☐ Yes ☒ No **Explain:**

Due to the limitations of the data described in Section B.1.b, it is not possible to draw conclusions about the data. The problems of small sample size and low survey participation rates are even more substantial for the YSS and YSS-F than they are for the CANS.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

Section D - County and Provider Use of RBS Program:

1. a. During the reporting period, has the operation of the program significantly changed from the original design described in the approved plan? If yes, describe the change.

☐ Yes ☒ No Explain:

- b. If yes, how has this adaptation impacted the effectiveness of the project?

N/A

2. During the reporting period, have there been any significant differences from the roles and responsibilities delineated in the approved plan for the various county agencies and provider(s)? If yes, describe the differences.

☐ Yes ☒ No Explain:

3. Were RBS enrollments sufficient during the reporting period? If not, why not?

☒ Yes ☐ No Explain:

San Francisco has enrolled their target number of 42 youths and we are continuing to enroll youth in the program.

4. Describe how the county and provider(s) managed RBS staff resources during the reporting period (e.g., filling vacancies, redefining job qualifications, eliminating positions, etc.)

There have been some staffing challenges with certain positions although several of these have been recently resolved. Providers have stated that staffing gaps resulted largely from limitations with the funding model.

All three providers have experienced challenges staffing the family finding position and ensuring the integration of family finding into the daily RBS work. Part of this is because of the limited number of hours designated to the family finding position, and the need to infuse it across all points of the program. San Francisco is continuing to look at the family finding efforts and identify ways to strengthen this, including ongoing trainings and consultations.

By the end of 2012, all three providers had filled the Parent Partner position. It took some of the providers longer than others due to budget issues and ensuring the appropriate fit for the position. Additionally, one of the providers has just brought on facilitators for their Family Team Meetings.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

San Francisco is also discussing how best to embed the individual/family therapy within the RBS program. In some instances, RBS youth receive those services from outside providers. While this may be appropriate in some cases (i.e. youth in day treatment, or in transitioning to community based treatment toward the end of RBS services), it does lead to additional challenges and considerations as outside providers are not necessarily familiar with or aligned with the RBS program vision.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section E - County Payments to Nonprofit Agency(ies):

Note: The payments reported here are from the county records as recorded on a cash basis during the reporting period from January 1 to December 31, for all providers participating in the RBS demonstration project.

1. For Questions a through c, please complete the table below:
 - a. Report the total payments from all fund sources paid to the provider(s) for RBS during the period the report covers under each of the following:
 - Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC). (The amounts reported here should come from the amount reported under H1, amount claimed per fiscal tracking sheet. They will not be equal because H1 is cumulative for the project and F1 is only for the reporting year.)
 - Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT).
 - Mental Health Services Act (MHSA).
 - Grants, loans, other. (Itemize any amounts reported by source.)
 - b. Provide the Average Months of Stay in Group Care for all children/youth enrolled in group home care during the reporting period.
 - c. Provide the Average Months of Stay in Community Care for all children/youth enrolled in community services (not in group home) during the reporting period.

	AFDC-FC	EPSDT	MHSA	Other	Total
Amount Paid for Residential	\$1,590,008.51	\$414,152.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,004,160.51
Amount Paid for Community	\$441,059.62	\$178,581.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$619,640.62
Total Amount Paid	\$2,031,068.13	\$592,733.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,623,801.13
Avg. Length of Stay in Residential	3.95 months	3.95 months			
Avg. Length of Stay in Community	6.5 months	6.5 months			
Avg. AFDC-FC Payment Per Youth in Residential	\$10,319	\$2,688	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$13,007
Avg. AFDC-FC Payment per Youth in Community	\$3,394	\$1,374	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,768

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

*****PLEASE NOTE**

Calculations and the associated averages for section E were made using the total number of active RBS clients (39) for 2012. However, it is important to point out that some of these youth were only active for weeks or months during this calendar year. As a result the numbers are skewed, and the average length of stay in residential care is artificially low. The true average length of stay would need to be calculated once youth graduated or were discharged from RBS. This discrepancy is reflected in Section F of the actual provider costs, which indicates a higher actual cost than would be presumed with the average length of stay reported in this section.

2. **Were any changes made to the Funding Model in order to manage payment shortfalls/overages, incentives, refunds during the reporting period? If yes, explain what the changes were and why they were needed.**

[] Yes [X] No Explain:

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section F - Actual Costs of Nonprofit Agency(ies):

Note: The amounts reported here should be based on each provider's accounting records for RBS for the period from January 1 through December 31, and be on a basis consistent with the method used to report costs on the annual A-133 Financial Audit Report and SR3 document filed with CDSS.

1. a. **For residential costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project.**

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

Actual Costs in RBS Residential:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$222,042	\$122,846	\$(99,196)
Total Operating Costs	\$366,707	\$812,487	\$445,780
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$967,529	\$1,019,197	\$51,667
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$721,690	\$1,004,317	\$282,628
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Indirect Costs	\$265,386	\$250,656	\$(14,729)
Total Expenditures	\$2,543,354	\$3,209,504	\$666,150

- b. **Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5 percent on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.**

[X] Yes [] No Explain:

The total was 26% over budget

With the exception of significant outliers, youth exceeded the targeted length of stay for the residential program across all three providers. This occurred for multiple reasons, including the need for crisis stabilization which impacted the total residential placement

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

time, disruptions with the particular step-down plans and the need to return to the residential component until an alternate plan could be made, lack of housing for identified caregivers, and legal challenges which prohibited timely step down.

As noted above, the average length of stay in the residential portion of RBS is artificially low due to including youth who exited this component early in 2012 or entered late in 2012. A number of youth were in residential treatment for an extensive period of time for reasons described in the above paragraph, which contributed to the provider actuals for this period of time. Please see Section H for further discussion.

2. a. **For community costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project.**

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

Actual Costs in RBS Community:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$100,877	\$40,954	\$(59,923)
Total Operating Costs	\$188,022	\$644,679	\$456,656
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$136,868	\$312,267	\$175,398
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$604,832	\$522,868	\$(81,964)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Indirect Costs	\$123,664	\$77,846	\$(45,818)
Total Expenditures	\$1,154,263	\$1,598,613	\$444,349

- b. **Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5 percent on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.**

☒ Yes ☐ No Explain:

The totals exceed the budget by 38%

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

There are several challenges involved in providing appropriate, consistent community support for youth stepping down from RBS residential components to the community. These challenges include: distance of placements and related travel costs, response to crisis or urgent situations, and the intensive team work with both the family and community agencies necessary to ensure good transitions to the community for these youth, all of whom have high needs.

These costs also include a particular situation in which the step-down plan was with an aunt living out of state, and there were significant associated costs for travel, staff support, etc. Consequently, San Francisco does not expect the budget to remain at such a high variance, but it is unclear if there will still be some excessive variance going forward.

- 3. Were there extraordinary costs associated with any particular child/youth (i.e., outliers as defined in the Funding Model)? If yes, provide the amount of the cost and describe what it purchased.**

☒ Yes ☐ No **Explain:**

During September and part of October, one of the RBS providers supported a transition plan with a client moving to Hawaii to live with a relative. Three different staff rotated stays during visits in Hawaii to support this transition. The additional costs related to per diem for each staff which along with travel were over \$15,000. This funding came out of the provider's operating budget and were not RBS-specific funds. Assistance included coordination with the local child welfare partners and services team to ensure a successful transition to the placement and to new child welfare, clinical, and education providers. However the placement was not finalized as the child returned to California.

In addition, all the providers averaged more than the five months of RBS residential care, often due to permanent placements falling through or other obstacles that were not under the control of the provider. These cases also prevented the providers from enrolling new youth into their RBS programs due to a lack of space in their residential components.

- 4. Has the county performed the fiscal audit required by the memorandum of understanding? If yes, describe any problems/issues with the provider's operations or implementation of the Funding Model that were disclosed by the fiscal audit performed. If no, when will that audit occur?**

☐ Yes ☒ No **Explain:**

One of the three providers did not start-up until July 2011. The plan is to conduct the audit once all three providers have completed 24 months of operation.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section G - Impact on AFDC-FC Costs:

- This is a cumulative report from the beginning of the project. Amounts reported are based on the amounts included in the claim presented to CDSS. Using the RBS claim fiscal tracking sheets, please complete the information below for all children served by RBS from the start of the project to the end of the reporting period:

RBS Payments for All Children Enrolled in RBS from the start of the project through the end of the Reporting Period:				
Total Children Served In RBS: <div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; width: 100px; text-align: center;">42</div>	Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
Federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$2,198,647.90	\$ 989,577.00	\$483,627.00	\$725,443.90
Community:	\$363,892.61	\$65,913.00	\$119,191.00	\$78,788.61
Total Federal Payments:	\$2,562,540.51	\$1,055,490.00	\$602,818.00	\$904,232.51
Non-federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$322,690.34	\$50,631.70	\$100,145.00	\$171,913.64
Community:	\$118,949.71	\$0.00	\$47,580.00	\$71,369.71
Total Non-federal Payments:	\$441,640.05	\$50,631.70	\$147,725.00	\$243,283.35
Total RBS Payments	\$3,004,180.56			

Note: It is possible to have federal funds used in the Non-federal Payment (i.e., non-federal RBS children) category. These payments would be the federal share of any Emergency Assistance Funding used in the RBS program up to the first 12 months of a child's stay in RBS. The amounts reported would come from the non-federal fiscal tracking sheet, and are based on the instructions provided in RBS Letter No. 03-11, dated June 21, 2011.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

2. **Of the children reported in G1 above, please complete the information below for all children who successfully entered and exited RBS in 24 months, or remained in RBS for a full 24 months.**

Note: When completing G2, it is important to understand how G2, G3, and G4 work to form the comparison to regular AFDC-FC costs. Section G4 is a comparison of cost for those children who have completed RBS (from G2) to the cost of regular foster care based on the target group base period (G3). In this context, a child "completing RBS" is one who has either entered the program and then exited after successfully completing his/her RBS program goal, or one who has entered the program and remained in the program longer than the base period (24 months). The comparison in Section G4 is done only for those children who have successfully completed the RBS program goal or are still in the program at the 24 month mark. The count of children for Section G2 and the related costs are only for those children who have completed the RBS program or remained in RBS longer than 24 months. For example, a child entering RBS who remains in the program for only 3 months and then is disenrolled would not be included in G2. A child entering RBS and still in the program at month 26 would be included in G2.

RBS Payments for all Children Entering and Exiting RBS in the 24 month Period or remaining in the program for 1 condition from the beginning of the project.):

**Total Children Completing
RBS: 3**

Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
---------------	-----------------	---------------	----------------

Federal Payments:

Residential:

\$155,433.53	\$80,722.37	\$28,081.11	\$46,630.06
\$74,920.90	\$40,843.85	\$11,600.78	\$22,476.27
\$230,354.43	\$121,566.22	\$39,681.89	\$69,106.33

Community:

Total Federal Payments:

Non-federal Payments:

Residential:

\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
\$921.71	\$0.00	\$368.684	\$553.026

Community:

Total Non-federal Payments:

\$921.71	\$0.00	\$368.684	\$553.026
-----------------	---------------	------------------	------------------

Total RBS Payments:

\$231,276.14

3. **Using the approved Attachment A from the Funding Model and the number of children**

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

reported in G2 (above), complete the information below regarding the expected base Foster Care costs for RBS target population children that otherwise would have been served in Foster Care.

Note: Since Section G3 of the CAR is used to compare the base AFDC-FC rates had the RBS youth remained in regular foster care, the "Approved Base Rate Per Child" is the weighted average of AFDC-FC payments for Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12 and RCL 14 placements as described and approved in the Funding Model. The "Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care" section is the approved comparison length for the RBS youth had they remained in regular foster care. For all RBS counties, the approved base months in regular foster care is 24 months, based on the demographic for the current length of stay in a group home for the target group. The "Applicable Federal Funds Rate" is the percentage of federal funds rate based on the federal medical assistance percentage (FMAP) used in the RBS claim. The CAR template has this FMAP funding rate pre-loaded at 50 percent because all of the RBS Funding Models used the pre-American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) FMAP rate of 50 percent for approval purposes. However, because Section G1 of the CAR instructs counties to use financial costs based on the RBS Fiscal Tracking sheets, counties must use the ARRA rate in effect for that month and quarter. For the months through and including December 2010, the ARRA rate is 56.2 percent. For the months beginning January 2011, the ARRA rate will decline until it reaches 50 percent beginning July 2011. Details on the ARRA rates used in the RBS claim are in an RBS claim letter. In order to produce a correct comparison of costs between sections G1, G2, and G3, whatever federal funds rate is used in Section G1 should be the same rate used for G2 and G3.

Note: If zero have completed, enter zero for this reporting period comparison.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Please note that the approved base rate per child figure of \$8,445.50 is from Attachment A of the Voluntary Agreement, and represents the average rate of RCL 12 and 14 . This is the same rate that was reflected in the prior year's report.

AFDC-FC Base for Comparison:

Approved Base Rate Per Child:	\$8,445.50	(from H2, above)
Number of Children Completing RBS:	3	
Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care:	24	
Applicable Federal Funds Rate:	50%	

	Total	Federal	State	County
Base Payment for Target Group:	\$608,076	\$304,038	\$121,615.20	\$182,422.80

4. a. For those children who have completed the RBS program, using the information from G2 and G3 above, subtract G3 from G2 and complete the following information:

	Total	Federal	State	County
RBS Incremental Cost/(Savings)Based On Program Completion:	\$ -376,799.86	\$ -182,471.78	\$ -81,564.63	\$ -112,763

- b. What aspects of operating RBS contributed to the cost/savings compared to regular Foster Care?

About three youths successfully completed the RBS program, stepping down from residential treatment into either adoptive, foster or biological families. These cases generated savings as more costly residential payments were no longer required as children stepped down into the family homes. Family finding, family engagement and support, follow-along services, and crisis stabilization all contributed to the success of these placements.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

5. **Has EPSDT usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it's different.**

[X] Yes [] No Explain:

It appears that the costs have been higher and is averaging more than both SB163 wraparound EPSDT costs as well as residential treatment EPSDT. Spending among providers is also very different. CBHS is conducting further analysis of the RBS EPSDT expenditures and overall impact on EPSDT.

6. **Has MHSA usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it's different.**

[] Yes [] No Explain:

N/A

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

Section H - Lessons Learned:**1. Describe the most significant program lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.**

- 1) Concurrent planning is vital to the success of the program. If youth do not have viable plans A, B, and C, the chances of achieving permanency within the time frames of the RBS pilot are more difficult.
- 2) Referrals need to be carefully assessed to ensure that RBS is an appropriate program for a youth. When youth do not have solid permanency options, have severe mental health needs, or have significant behavioral issues such as AWOLing, the RBS program has been less successful.
- 3) The clinical care coordinators have been providing all the clinical case management as well as some of the therapy, which has been a significant challenge. The staffing plan may need to include an additional therapist so that these functions can be better managed.
- 4) Additional training is needed for family specialist staff whose work history is in residential treatment rather than as a community provider. Training should focus on how to work in the community and provide mental health individual rehab work.
- 5) Family finding work is fundamental to the success of the program, but needs additional resources in order to expand and be fully effective.

2. Describe the most significant fiscal lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.

- 1) The assumptions behind the financial model do not reflect actual expenses as reported by the providers. Budget neutrality and the subsequent assumptions of length of residential stay and community-based costs did not result in adequate financing. This made it difficult to be financially viable while meeting program model requirements.
- 2) The small sample size did not allow financial risk to be spread across a sufficient number of clients. Larger group size or financial risk across the entire partnership could mitigate this significantly.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report**

- 3) Factors unrelated to the client, and largely out of the control of the provider agency, often play a larger role in discharge from residential care than clinical factors (e.g. legal issues, housing/logistic issues, caregiver capacity and readiness, etc.).
- 4) The providers reported that there must be adequate EPSDT funding to support the community-based services.
- 5) It is important to do concurrent permanency plans from the start to mitigate longer stays in the residential component.
- 6) San Francisco has needed to continually clarify admission criteria for RBS program and review multiple factors that may influence length of stay in residential placement and success factors in -home/community placement.

RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE
County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2
(Revised June 2012)

Attachment II

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corp. Name: St. Vincents **Program Number:** **Contact Person:** Liz Crudo
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 **Telephone Number:** 415-557-6502 **Date Completed:** 2/24/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care						RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS		
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS
1	L2V1rF338A	3/14/2011	8/5/2011	144	-	8/5/2011	7/23/2012	353	-		Yes			-	-	2	-	497
2	*L2V1rF338A	7/23/2012	11/28/2012	128	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	128	-
3	EKW0iiC50Q	3/14/2011	7/28/2011	136	-	7/28/2011		-	522		No			-	-	2	-	658
4	CGlfGsr21F	3/14/2011	8/4/2011	143	-			-	-		Yes	8/4/2011	3/1/2012	210	-	3	-	353
5	*CGlfGsr21F			-	-	3/1/2012		-	305		Yes			-	-	2	-	305
6	HYnhffO193	3/21/2011	8/4/2011	136	-			-	-		Yes	8/4/2011	9/2/2011	29	-	3	-	165
7	*HYnhffO193	9/2/2011	9/29/2011	27	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	27	-
8	3235jTX87C	3/21/2011	7/29/2011	130	-	7/29/2011	6/4/2012	311	-		Yes			-	-	2	-	441
9	*3235jTX87C	6/4/2012		-	210			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	210
10	FBuY3ATAcR	8/3/2011	9/4/2012	398	-			-	-		No	9/4/2012	10/19/2012	45	-	3	-	443
11	*FBuY3ATAcR	10/19/2012		-	73			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	73
12	Fjj4qJj4zC	8/11/2011	1/11/2012	153	-			-	-		No	1/11/2012	8/2/2012	204	-	4	357	-
13	MJfnwUH50Q	8/11/2011	6/8/2012	302	-			-	-		Yes	6/8/2012	8/21/2012	74	-	3	-	376
14	*MJfnwUH50Q	8/21/2012		-	132			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	132
15	7Nsoxql6zm	8/11/2011	3/30/2012	232	-			-	-		No	3/30/2012		-	276	3	-	508
16	Ld1jQOd92i	3/21/2011	7/25/2011	126	-	7/25/2011		-	525		No			-	-	2	-	651
17	KjtsC4U2hL	10/22/2012		-	70			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	70
18				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
19				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
20				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
21				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
22				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
23				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
24				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-

Current Status Codes:

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercase Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE FOR CRISIS STABILIZATION
County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2
(Revised June 2012)

Attachment II

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode

Non-Profit Corp. Name: St. Vincents **Program Number:** **Contact Person:** Liz Crudo
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 **Telephone Number:** 415-557-6502 **Date Completed:** 2/24/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1	L2V1rF338A	9/26/2011	10/2/2011	6	-	5/15/2012	5/21/2012	6	-	7/9/2012	7/23/2012	14	-
2	HYnhffO193	8/24/2011	9/2/2011	9	-			-	-			-	-
3	CGlfGsr21F	12/15/2011	12/17/2011	2	-	2/23/2012	3/1/2012	7	-			-	-
4	*CGlfGsr21F	10/31/2012	11/1/2012	1	-			-	-			-	-
5	3235jTX87C	1/3/2012	1/9/2012	6	-	4/7/2012	4/17/2012	10	-	5/7/2012	5/8/2012	1	-
6	*3235jTX87C	5/21/2012	6/4/2012	14	-			-	-			-	-
7	MJfnwUH50Q	8/15/2012	8/21/2012	6	-			-	-			-	-
8				-	-			-	-			-	-
9				-	-			-	-			-	-
10				-	-			-	-			-	-
11				-	-			-	-			-	-
12				-	-			-	-			-	-
13				-	-			-	-			-	-
14				-	-			-	-			-	-
15				-	-			-	-			-	-
16				-	-			-	-			-	-
17				-	-			-	-			-	-
18				-	-			-	-			-	-
19				-	-			-	-			-	-
20				-	-			-	-			-	-
21				-	-			-	-			-	-
22				-	-			-	-			-	-
23				-	-			-	-			-	-
24				-	-			-	-			-	-

RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE
County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2
(Revised June 2012)

Attachment II

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corp. Name: Seneca Center **Program Number:** **Contact Person:** Liz Crudo
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 **Telephone Number:** 415-557-6502 **Date Completed:** 2/24/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care						RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS		
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS
1	Cw5iGA64y1	7/12/2011	9/3/2011	53	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	53	-
2	AuA2juL4wm	9/6/2011	11/11/2011	66	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	66	-
3	5feCBzl34A	9/14/2011	1/9/2012	117	-			-	-		No	1/9/2012		-	357	3	-	474
4	7UNJKDP50Q	11/15/2011	4/17/2012	154	-			-	-		No	4/17/2012	10/11/2012	177	-	4	331	-
5	TF3Fs60668	11/22/2011	1/27/2012	66	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	66	-
6	Tnh7ekB4wm	1/5/2012	6/25/2012	172	-			-	-		No	6/25/2012		-	189	3	-	361
7	KTVcnUy668	1/17/2012	11/18/2012	306	-	11/18/2012		-	43		No			-	-	2	-	349
8	Si4PuAWi668	1/17/2012	11/18/2012	306	-	11/18/2012		-	43		No			-	-	2	-	349
9	BYs54NA5th	2/21/2012	9/6/2012	198	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	198	-
10	9tIj7Tu4wm	4/3/2012	5/18/2012	45	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	45	-
11	NLo1lO14wm	4/19/2012	11/15/2012	210	-			-	-		No	11/15/2012		-	46	3	-	256
12	lvLXhDe4wm	6/18/2012		-	196			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	196
13	DF8EWd34wm	8/6/2012		-	147			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	147
14	2HKviWX8fE	11/1/2012	12/28/2012	57	-			-	-		No			-	-	7	57	-
15	H1RJlIB07S	11/20/2012		-	41			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	41
16	Cw5iGA64y1	11/26/2012		-	35			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	35
17	84WLSnz4y1	12/10/2012		-	21			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	21
18	R0DeAOU4y1	12/13/2012		-	18			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	18
19				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
20				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
21				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
22				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
23				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
24				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-

Current Status Codes:

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercase Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE FOR CRISIS STABILIZATION
County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2
(Revised June 2012)

Attachment II

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode

Non-Profit Corp. Name: Seneca Center **Program Number:** **Contact Person:** Liz Crudo
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 **Telephone Number:** 415-557-6502 **Date Completed:** 2/24/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1				-	-			-	-			-	-
2				-	-			-	-			-	-
3				-	-			-	-			-	-
4				-	-			-	-			-	-
5				-	-			-	-			-	-
6				-	-			-	-			-	-
7				-	-			-	-			-	-
8				-	-			-	-			-	-
9				-	-			-	-			-	-
10				-	-			-	-			-	-
11				-	-			-	-			-	-
12				-	-			-	-			-	-
13				-	-			-	-			-	-
14				-	-			-	-			-	-
15				-	-			-	-			-	-
16				-	-			-	-			-	-
17				-	-			-	-			-	-
18				-	-			-	-			-	-
19				-	-			-	-			-	-
20				-	-			-	-			-	-
21				-	-			-	-			-	-
22				-	-			-	-			-	-
23				-	-			-	-			-	-
24				-	-			-	-			-	-

RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE
County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2
(Revised June 2012)

Attachment II

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since implementation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corp. Name: Edgewood Center

Program Number:

Contact Person: Liz Crudo

Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012

Telephone Number: 415-557-6502

Date Completed: 2/24/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care						RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS		
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS
1	IX4srVW8AH	3/7/2011	8/12/2011	158	-			-	-		yes	8/12/2011	10/18/2011	67	-	3	-	225
2	*IX4srVW8AH	10/18/2011	8/6/2012	293	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	293	-
3	Ewlt0304y1	3/7/2011	9/16/2011	193	-			-	-		yes	9/16/2011		-	472	3	-	665
4	lBeVdl107S	3/7/2011	4/1/2012	391	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	391	-
5	lNigeqU4wm	3/7/2011	6/1/2012	452	-			-	-		No	6/1/2012		-	213	3	-	665
6	lorGDcf38A	3/7/2011	9/4/2011	181	-	9/4/2011	12/23/2011	110	-		yes			-	-	2	-	291
7	*lorGDcf38A	12/23/2011	1/25/2012	33	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	33	-
8	MLiPwNK4wn	3/7/2011	10/28/2011	235	-			-	-		No	10/28/2011	12/12/2012	411	-	4	646	-
9	ArVMEGm4wt	1/26/2012		-	340			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	340
10	QxAMQ7v6zt	1/12/2012		-	354			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	354
11	7azm5BL6zt	1/11/2012	11/16/2012	310	-	11/16/2012		-	45		No			-	-	2	-	355
12	BQyig7h8Am	8/20/2012	10/15/2012	56	-			-	-		No			-	-	6	56	-
13	QRwli1vCMX	10/1/2012		-	91			-	-		No			-	-	1	-	91
14	ONAUuyo92i	10/18/2012	10/19/2012	1	-			-	-		No	10/19/2012		-	73	3	-	74
15	lpbwKUy9n2	11/29/2012		-	32			-	-					-	-	1	-	32
16				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
17				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
18				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
19				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
20				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
21				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
22				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
23				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-
24				-	-			-	-					-	-		-	-

Current Status Codes:

- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
- 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
- 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercase Services
- 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
- 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
- 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
- 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
- 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE FOR CRISIS STABILIZATION
County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 2
(Revised June 2012)

Attachment II

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

List the youth who have had a Crisis Stabilization episode during the report period and show the number of days in each placement per episode. (The total number of days a client spends in Crisis Stabilization runs concurrently and is included in the total number of days in the Community component the youth was in when the Crisis Stabilization episode

Non-Profit Corp. Name: Edgewood Center **Program Number:** **Contact Person:** Liz Crudo
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2012 **Telephone Number:** 415-557-6502 **Date Completed:** 2/24/2013

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Youth Enrolled		#1 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#2 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT				#3 RBS CRISIS STABILIZATION PLACEMENT			
Use Youth's Foreign Client Key Only; List in order of Date of Admission		Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Crisis Stabilization, Total Days To Date
1	lX4srVW8AH	8/25/2011	8/26/2011	1	-			-	-			-	-
2	lorGDcf38A	10/2/2011	10/3/2011	1	-			-	-			-	-
3	Ewlt0304y1	9/28/2012	10/2/2012	4	-			-	-			-	-
4				-	-			-	-			-	-
5				-	-			-	-			-	-
6				-	-			-	-			-	-
7				-	-			-	-			-	-
8				-	-			-	-			-	-
9				-	-			-	-			-	-
10				-	-			-	-			-	-
11				-	-			-	-			-	-
12				-	-			-	-			-	-
13				-	-			-	-			-	-
14				-	-			-	-			-	-
15				-	-			-	-			-	-
16				-	-			-	-			-	-
17				-	-			-	-			-	-
18				-	-			-	-			-	-
19				-	-			-	-			-	-
20				-	-			-	-			-	-
21				-	-			-	-			-	-
22				-	-			-	-			-	-
23				-	-			-	-			-	-
24				-	-			-	-			-	-